

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SENATE

Regular Session

April 14, 2003
3:10 p.m.

W.T. Young Library
First Floor Auditorium
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. Jeffrey Dembo, Chair

ASSOCIATED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

FREELANCE COURT REPORTERS & VIDEO SERVICES

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, PRESIDENT

100 NORTH UPPER STREET

P. O. BOX 85, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40588

(859) 233-9272 (800) 882-3197

e-mail: arsl@alltel.net

JEFFREY DEMBO, CHAIR

GIFFORD BLYTON, PARLIAMENTARIAN

REBECCA SCOTT, SECRETARY TO SENATE

SUSAN WILLIAMS, SARGENT-AT-ARMS

STEPHANIE K. SCHLOEMER, COURT REPORTER

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: We'll
2 start with several announcements.

3 The first announcement is that at the
4 most recent Senate Council meeting, it was determined
5 that we're going to need to call one additional meeting
6 of the University Senate. And this is because of last
7 minute material that's either come through a committee
8 or is coming down from other parts of campus. So the
9 date that's been set is the first Monday in May, so
10 that would be May - - let's see, it's depends on what
11 continent you're on, I suppose. May the 5th at 3:00.
12 Angel, have we confirmed this room for that yet? Do
13 you know?

14 MS. WALDHART: Have you
15 sent an e-mail yet?

16 MS. CLARK: We haven't sent
17 e-mail yet, but we're going to--

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay, as
19 soon as we confirm that it's going to be in this room,
20 a message will be sent along with the agenda. The
21 second item for announcement is that - - I don't have
22 my wonderful PowerPoint up yet, but we have finally
23 filled the Senate Council full-time staff position.
24 And I'm pleased to introduce to you Rebecca Scott,
25 who's sitting at the far end here.

26 (Applause)

27 Rebecca received her Bachelor's

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Degree in English from UK in 1999. She is currently
2 working on her Master's in Educational Policy, and she
3 most recently comes to us from the Graduate School
4 where she was at actually the same level position there
5 and was responsible for important things like diploma
6 checkouts and other academic administration. One of
7 the reasons that we're so pleased to have her here is
8 because she has a very special interest in academic
9 policy and the like. So this is the perfect office in
10 which she'll get to pursue her interests and we'll get
11 to enjoy her expertise. So we're all really looking
12 forward to working with Rebecca. I'm sure you'll see a
13 very positive, efficient manager in the Senate Council
14 office. So welcome aboard, Rebecca.

15 MS. SCOTT: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The second
17 announcement is just ongoing committee business.

18 There's been some interesting
19 committee activity. The one I'd like to have brought
20 forward right now is a very brief announcement from Kay
21 Chard. You may recall an announcement we made at a
22 previous meeting, but there's been a special joint
23 committee that's been set up. It's the joint committee
24 of both Academic and Organization Structure and
25 Academic Programs. (Technical difficulties) I'll get
26 back to earth here in a second. And this committee has
27 been charged specifically to look at formulation of

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 guidelines for discontinuation of academic programs.
2 So, Kate, you've had a meeting so far. Report what
3 progress has been made.

4 MS. CHARD: We actually
5 have made a lot of progress in the meeting and we have
6 a first draft of discontinuation of programs already
7 out and about and the committee's reviewing it. I
8 would expect to have the final draft to your Senate
9 Council meeting prior to our end of the year meeting,
10 so we can vote on it here at the end of the year.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: And what's
12 been the mind set that the Committee has approached
13 this task?

14 MS. CHARD: Try to find as
15 much as we can that's already been done and replicate.
16 (Laughter)

17 Part of the problem is that we
18 haven't found much. We went to the AAUP and they have,
19 of course, guidelines for how to handle an individual
20 professor when the professor is being terminated, but
21 they don't have very much at all when it comes to
22 terminating a program. We went to the entire benchmark
23 Web pages, and I actually called several that did not
24 have anything on their Web pages, and actually the
25 majority of our benchmarks do not have a policy at all
26 for how to discontinue or terminate an entire program,
27 unit, college or even a center. So we're having to

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Before, is there any other old business to take care
2 of? I don't believe so.

3 The first agenda item for today is to
4 discuss the Selective Admissions report and, Enid,
5 while I'm trying to get this on maybe you can introduce
6 where it's come from.

7 MS. WALDHART: The
8 Selective Admissions report came to us from a group
9 headed by Bill Fortune.

10 Are you prepared to answer questions
11 today?

12 MR. FORTUNE: I will try.

13 MS. WALDHART: Okay. So
14 he's here to defend himself and all the actions that
15 they've taken.

16 The selective admissions concern came
17 up as we were talking about criteria that can be used
18 by colleges with selective admissions and a very great
19 concern about using GPA as the primary or even the sole
20 criterion for selective admission. And so from the
21 committee report which you have had, the Council only
22 changed one part of it to indicate that -- Do you have
23 this written down on there? Because it will be easier
24 to read.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I do. I'm
26 trying to get this to work. (Technical difficulties)

27 MS. WALDHART: Okay.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 (MOTION) The Senate Rules should be amended to state
2 that all proposals to create or change admissions
3 requirements in colleges and programs must provide in
4 detail the rationale for each criterion in the
5 proposal. Limiting enrollment solely by overall GPA is
6 not acceptable. For example, if the rationale of the
7 proposal is predominantly to limit enrollment, then the
8 college or program cannot accommodate the anticipated
9 student load without compromising academic integrity.
10 The published appeals process must include the date by
11 which student must appeal and the date by which the
12 appeal decision will be reported to the student. And
13 those were things that the Senate Council added to the
14 proposal that came from the committee itself.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Give me
16 one more second. I'll see if I can get this running.
17 (Technical difficulties)

18 MS. WALDHART: And I guess
19 I should add that the Council supported this proposal,
20 which is sort of important, isn't it? Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Bill, do
22 you have any other background that you want to add to
23 that?

24 MR. FORTUNE: Not unless
25 the members of the Senate want it.

26 (Laughter)

27 But if you all do, I'd be happy to

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 answer questions.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Give me 30
3 more seconds. It might help if I can get this file up.
4 (Meeting paused)

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So the
6 excitement that generated this was February 2002 Senate
7 meeting where the College of Communications and
8 Information Studies wanted to change the selective
9 admissions criteria, and that generated the formation
10 of this committee to take a look at the whole notion of
11 selective admissions and what are acceptable criteria.
12 So the five things that were listed -- Enid, have you
13 read them?

14 MS. WALDHART: I did not
15 read them out loud.

16
17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So
18 the five recommendations of the committee were as
19 follows:

20 That, number one, the University
21 calendar should be changed to provide that currently
22 enrolled students may change major, college, or both at
23 any time except for the period in the spring and fall
24 beginning four weeks prior to the start of priority
25 registration and running through the last day of
26 secondary windows. Informational materials should be
27 changed accordingly. And the rationale for this was

1 because the recommendation grew out of the discussion
2 of this issue, that it was exacerbated by a lack
3 advising which has in turn been caused by students
4 seeking to transfer from one college to another during
5 these periods when advisors are already busy with
6 registration. So, that would provide some standard to
7 when these types of things could occur.

8 The second recommendation was that
9 the Senate Rules should be amended to state that all
10 proposals to create or change admissions requirements
11 in colleges and programs must provide a detailed
12 rationale for each criterion in the proposal. Limiting
13 enrollment solely by overall grade point average is not
14 acceptable. For example, if the rationale of the
15 proposal is predominantly to limit enrollment in a
16 college, then the college or program cannot accommodate
17 the anticipated student load without compromising
18 academic integrity. So, in other words, the latter
19 would be the rationale for justifying the former.
20 There was much discussion in the Senate Council about
21 that particular point.

22 MS. WALDHART: And that's
23 where we added on that the published appeals process.
24 Okay, it must be printed.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Right.
26 That the published appeals process must include the
27 date and time by which an appeals decision would be

1 reported to a student.

2 Another recommendation, we urge the
3 Provost to maintain a reserve to supplement the
4 resources of colleges and programs subject to
5 fluctuating student interests. The Provost should
6 maintain as much flexibility as possible with this
7 reserve in order to allow resources to mirror demand as
8 student interests in programs fluctuates.

9 And then, finally, we urge the
10 administration to try to manage enrollment by setting
11 freshman and transfer enrollment targets seven years --
12 several years in advance. Yes, seven years in advance.
13 Try that one. And coordinate the University's
14 resources to plan for expansion of faculty and other
15 resources to meet any projected increase in the student
16 body.

17 So, first, again, I apologize for not
18 having it on the PowerPoint. Maybe by the time we
19 finish this discussion, the disk will be working.

20 First, are there any questions about
21 the essence of the recommendations? Professor Gesund?

22 MR. GESUND: Hans Gesund,
23 Engineering.

24 You didn't mention the appeals
25 business. The recommendation that everybody has to set
26 up an appeals process.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: May I read

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 that more fully, since you brought that up?

2 MR. GESUND: Well, one
3 thing ... Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Go ahead.

5 MR. GESUND: I would like
6 to comment on that.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Sure.

8 Just for sake of completeness, we recommend that all
9 programs and colleges with selective admissions must
10 have a published appeals process whereby students who
11 fail to meet requirements may request to have their
12 applications individually reviewed. The published
13 appeals process must include the date by which the
14 student must appeal and the date by which the appeals
15 decision will be reported to the student.

16 MR. GESUND: Well, does
17 that include the School of Architecture and the
18 Colleges of Law, Medicine, and Dentistry, which accept
19 only a small proportion of their applicants and which
20 have a committee which actually makes the judgment.
21 Does this mean that those schools all have to now set
22 up second committees to which all the students who are
23 rejected for admission can appeal? And that second
24 committee obviously would have to be different from the
25 first committee. Otherwise it doesn't make any sense.
26 So did you mean to include those schools, those
27 professional schools, or was that just a slip that they

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 got included?

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
3 Fortune?

4 MR. FORTUNE: I think it's
5 fair to say, Hans, that we didn't anticipate that this
6 would be applied to the professional schools. This is
7 a transfer - - these are students who are trying to get
8 into an undergraduate college or into a program, but I
9 think if there is a question concerning this, that
10 ought to be made clear so I think your point's well
11 taken. The committee simply never thought in terms of
12 this being applied to the professional schools.

13 MR. GESUND: But the way
14 the rule is written they are included, so I think
15 somebody has to rewrite this thing at this point
16 perhaps.

17 I hate to do this on the floor of the
18 Senate, but perhaps somebody needs to move an amendment
19 to the effect that the School of Architecture, the
20 College of Medicine, Dentistry, and Law are excluded
21 from this. I so move.

22 MS. STATON: And Pharmacy.

23 MR. GESUND: And Pharmacy
24 and Graduate School.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

26 MR. GESUND: I mean, that's
27 why I hate to do this on the floor of the Senate. I

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 think I would prefer that the Senate Council take this
2 thing back and work it over. I have a few more
3 suggestions which I communicated to you.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay, any
5 comments about the first suggestion?

6 MR. CIBULL: Well, why
7 don't you simply limit it to undergraduate programs. I
8 don't think it has to be taken back. Put in a sentence
9 limiting this to undergraduate programs.

10 COURT REPORTER: May I have
11 your name? I'll learn it some day, but--

12 MR. CIBULL: Mike Cibull,
13 College of Medicine.

14 MS. ARNOLD: I'll SECOND.

15 COURT REPORTER: Who
16 seconded?

17 MS. ARNOLD: Susanne
18 Arnold.

19 MR. CIBULL: And
20 undergraduate programs excluding Architecture.

21 COURT REPORTER: What was
22 your last name again, please?

23 MS. ARNOLD: Susanne
24 Arnold, Medicine.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
26 Harrison?

27 MS. HARRISON: May I speak

1 to the motion? Anne Harrison, College of Health
2 Sciences.

3 There's at least one program that's a
4 dual-degree professional program, Physical Therapy. I
5 think that Physician's Assistant program may be the
6 same way in the College of Health Sciences where you
7 get a BS/MS degree, BHS/MS degree combined. So once
8 you're admitted to one, you roll over into the other
9 automatically. So making it into just an undergraduate
10 application might not work for those schools as well.
11 So, those are professional medical programs as well.

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dean
13 Johnson.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Can I suggest
15 that there's considerable ambiguity at the University
16 of what constitutes a professional program because one
17 of the programs that is most effective in our college
18 that led to the enrollment management proposal in the
19 first place because of their accreditation requirements
20 is the School of Journalism and Telecommunications
21 which considers itself to be a professional program.
22 So this limiting it to some professional programs and
23 not others is problematic.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other
25 thoughts? Professor Canon?

26 MR. CANON: Brad Canon,
27 Political Science.

1 I'm wondering what the rationale for
2 having an appeals process even at the undergraduate
3 level is? It seems when you apply and, you know, let's
4 say you have a -- the program demands a 2.8 and you
5 have a 2.6 and you're rejected, you can always -- the
6 student, of course, can always write to the Dean and
7 ask, but I don't quite see the rationale for any kind
8 of appeal. I think we're going to tie ourselves up in
9 red tape.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: If a
11 student has a 2.9 and is rejected, that student would
12 not have any idea of the reason for rejection, though.
13 Is that correct?

14 MR. CANON: Well, I don't
15 know. Are students rejected when they meet all the
16 criteria?

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So how
19 about somebody who can speak to the ongoing procedure
20 at present in a selective admissions college?

21 David, is there any reason given to
22 students right now for rejection?

23 MR. JOHNSON: We have an
24 appeals process. One feature of this I'm not sure, and
25 Enid might be able to correct me, is if we specify the
26 date on which we have to respond to the student. And
27 the nature of the appeal can be various, you know,

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 extenuating circumstances for health or other reasons
2 that might have affected somebody's grade point average
3 and so forth. So the committee doesn't arbitrarily
4 just enforce the 2.6. They look at other mitigating
5 factors.

6 MR. CANON: Is this the
7 first time or the second time?

8 MR. JOHNSON: The first
9 time or second time that they request?

10 MR. CANON: The first time
11 you apply and you're rejected.

12 MR. JOHNSON: The first
13 time you apply, the procedures that are spelled out in
14 the Senate rules are routinely applied and then at that
15 point, the student can appeal the decision.

16 MR. TAGAVI: Kaveh Tagavi.

17 Let me reemphasize to some degree
18 what Brad said. There is another aspect of this which
19 is problematic and that is an appeal implies that you
20 could not have a set of objective admission
21 requirements. Yes, that if there is a clerical error
22 like the one that you mentioned, if your requirement is
23 2.8 and somebody is rejected even if they have 2.9, of
24 course there should be an appeal where you would check
25 your clerical problem.

26 But if you can have a set of
27 objective criteria, you appeal it, you would assume

1 that somebody's going to be doing the same again and
2 again and again. So, in my opinion, the implication of
3 this is you must have either a set of objective
4 criteria so that when a student appeals, they might get
5 a different answer to their appeal or you must allow
6 waiver of your rule. You could not have no exceptions,
7 and I think that's problematic. If any department
8 wants to do it, I think they should be welcome to do
9 it, but I don't think you should be forced to have this
10 type of exception.

11 In addition, when somebody appeals,
12 could they get extra material because if they don't get
13 any extra material, I suppose that the result would be
14 the same. Some departments forbid extra material.
15 They say, don't send a letter of intent, don't send GRE
16 advance because we are not going to look at it, and a
17 lot of people who appeal who submit extra set of
18 material, is that fair to people who have not appealed?
19 And lastly, why shouldn't every single person appeal?
20 It's not as if they have anything to lose. Or maybe
21 next year we would deport them.

22 (Laughter)

23 But if we don't, everybody should
24 appeal. I mean, I would recommend every single person
25 should appeal.

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So are you
27 speaking in favor of Brad's suggestion that there

1 should not be an appeals process.

2 MR. TAGAVI: I have concern
3 about that, but that's somewhat speaking to the
4 amendment. But if that amendment passes or not, I'd
5 like to have another amendment to drop number three
6 altogether.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

8 MS. WALDHART: This is just
9 speaking on behalf of students. I think the idea of
10 having an appeals process was that there may be
11 extenuating circumstances that these would be like all
12 other appeals processes. University admissions has
13 clear criteria for admissions. It also has an appeals
14 process for people who are rejected. And so the idea
15 was that this would entitle students to make their case
16 however that would be, whether it is with additional
17 materials, whatever, that the idea was that it would be
18 a written appeal and that this appeal would be
19 considered by the college. It's not a guarantee of
20 admission, acceptance, any of those things. It just
21 says on a case-by-case basis we will consider appeals.

22 And, Kaveh, you're right. It would
23 be a silly student who might not want to do that, but
24 some students are so far away that they choose not to;
25 and those who are closer are much more likely to be
26 appealing. But the right of appeal, it seems to me,
27 ought to be available to anybody who wanted to appeal.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Not a guarantee of acceptance because you appeal, but
2 the right to appeal should be there, and it should be
3 in writing.

4 And the addition that we made to make
5 sure that there was a date -- that it meant that there
6 was an end to the process and that students would know,
7 because sometimes now they do not know when their case
8 has been considered. So I think that's why we put the
9 dates in and why I think an appeals process is
10 critical.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
12 Grossman?

13 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob
14 Grossman, Chemistry. I'm afraid I agree with Brad. I
15 think the appeals process is a terrible idea. No one
16 has any right to enter a program. The place for
17 extenuating circumstances to be considered is in the
18 initial admissions process. And any admissions process
19 set up by any reasonable group of people at this
20 University will take into account the idea that someone
21 has a 2.7 instead of a 2.8, but there were extenuating
22 circumstances that explain that and they have all these
23 other talents that should admit them to the program.
24 There's no right to get into any program, and there's
25 no reason there should be an appeals process involved.
26 You know, the committees make these decisions. They
27 make them as well and as fairly as they possible can,

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 but when you have five positions and twenty people
2 apply, even if half of them are qualified, some people
3 are going to be left out. These are very subjective
4 decisions. We all know that, but that's the nature of
5 the beast.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I'll get -
7 - Hans, you're next.

8 MR. GROSS: Don Gross,
9 Political Science. I'll disagree with my colleague
10 from Political Science here that something else about
11 this University is that it's a really large
12 bureaucracy. I mean having someone whose had a
13 daughter at this University and had friends who tried
14 to get in to colleges and departments, there are
15 numerous bureaucratic screw-ups, misinformation, bad
16 information, that students get, and a lot of times it's
17 not their fault. Now, you know, a wide open appeals
18 process can be problematic, but there are circumstances
19 where things happen which is simply beyond the
20 student's control and they have a right to say I have
21 this information documented, written down, and it was
22 wrong, and now I'm being excluded from the program.
23 And that's a problem which you are going to have to
24 address when you've got a lot of bureaucracy.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Hans?

26 MR. GESUND: In my
27 department, we have an appeals process for students who

1 don't make the cut-off on GPA. My suggestion might be
2 that if the original selection was made by an
3 admissions committee, then there probably need not be
4 an appeals process because if there is one, we have to
5 have two admissions committees, an admissions committee
6 and an admissions appeals committee. If, however, the
7 acceptance or rejection was done by a single person --
8 a director of undergraduate studies, a director of
9 graduate studies, what have you, or if it was done on
10 an automatic basis, you got a 2.79, we require a 2.8.
11 Sorry, Bub. Then, I think there should be an appeals
12 committee.

13 So it becomes a matter of if a
14 faculty committee should be involved in the process,
15 either originally on admission or in the appeals
16 process. But, to have two faculty committees, one
17 judging the work of the previous committee, seems kind
18 of redundant to me and I think a waste of faculty
19 resources, because this sort of thing takes time. I'm
20 on our faculty appeals committee and we have, oh,
21 maybe, 24 to 30 appeals a year, and each one, oh,
22 requires 15, 20, 30 minutes to study, discuss, et
23 cetera. It kills a lot of time.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Are there
25 any student senators or student visitors that would
26 like to speak to this issue of appeals?

27 MR. WILDER: Brad Wilder,

1 Engineering.

2 COURT REPORTER: What's the
3 last name?

4 MR. WILDER: Wilder. What
5 would be the possibility of just having an appeals
6 process for maybe non-academic circumstances or
7 administrative misinformation?

8 MR. EDGERTON: Lee Edgerton
9 in Animal Science. It was my sense, Enid, in our
10 discussion in the Senate was not so much that we were
11 talking about an absolute right, but that we were
12 saying that whatever the process was going to be, as we
13 sort of assumed there will be some appeals, that that
14 process ought to be published some place so that people
15 could see what it was, and it might be very restrictive
16 in some programs and less restrictive in others.

17 But I think that my sense was that
18 the emphasis was not upon we are going to make certain
19 that everyone has a right to be heard, but that
20 whatever the process for an appeal is in that program
21 would be available for people to read.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So could
23 it be possible that colleges may differ widely in their
24 appeals process with one college, perhaps having a
25 full-blown executive faculty committee to see these
26 and other colleges where the burden of proof is on the
27 student to show why they should be heard at all and

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 must fulfill minimum criteria for having an appeal
2 heard? Is that something that we can let the colleges
3 do as long as there is a published appeals process?

4 MS. ARNOLD: Susanne
5 Arnold, Medicine.

6 This is a fairly loose statement, and
7 I think it fits with what you're saying. I'm not
8 against this at all. I think that the actual process
9 of having an appeal is important for students. We've
10 heard that from multiple people. Your suggestion isn't
11 a bad one for a particular department but why not let
12 them decide? You've left it that way in the writing of
13 number 3.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other
15 comments about the appeals process?

16 MR. FERRIER: Walter
17 Ferrier, Business and Economics.

18 I agree with Professor Tagavi that
19 the need for and nature of an appeals process is
20 largely a function of the criteria above and beyond the
21 GPA to be used by the college. I was hoping, perhaps,
22 members of the committee who initially debated this and
23 created the proposal could provide some examples of
24 other criteria to use. With large admissions in B&E,
25 for instance, there's several hundred applicants. I
26 struggle to find maybe criteria other than GPA to use
27 for such a large batch.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MR. FORTUNE: Wally, I
2 guess I'll speak to that. Jane Wells was on the
3 committee, and I believe that there is some kind of
4 appeals process within B&E and I don't know exactly
5 what it is. I don't recall now.

6 MR. FERRIER: No. I wasn't
7 talking about the appeals process. I'm actually
8 speaking to Item 2 on that proposal.

9 MR. FORTUNE: Oh, things
10 other than GPA? Like grades in selective courses,
11 interviews. For example, in the College of
12 Architecture, they do it by an interview process. The
13 grades in selective courses, and I think that the
14 factor that we thought would be the most appropriate
15 factor rather than overall GPA -- and I'll speak to the
16 reason why that's referenced as it is. The sense of
17 the committee, and I think I speak for the whole
18 committee on this point, felt that using overall GPA
19 has caused students to be grade grubbers to their own
20 detriment and to seek out courses solely because of the
21 reputation of that particular course to get a good
22 grade in. And, in fact, there was a fair amount of
23 sentiment on the committee for not using overall GPA at
24 all as a factor. In fact, I personally voted against
25 using overall GPA as a factor. Now, the majority of
26 the committee thought that it could be a factor so long
27 as it wasn't the sole factor. The grades in specific

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 courses is what we thought may be the most appropriate
2 thing.

3 MR. MAREK: Jim Marek,
4 Engineering.

5 COURT REPORTER: Pardon? I
6 didn't hear you.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
8 Marek.

9 MR. MAREK: There is a
10 human factor in this and I don't hear it actual in
11 discussion at all, and we are actually affecting human
12 life and I think that not allowing people to have some
13 kind of appeals process is inhumane.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So would
15 you add anything to any of these recommendations to
16 make sure that's included?

17 MR. MAREK: Just the
18 appeals process is a part of being with our student
19 body. It seems that we need to be actually showing
20 them some respect and that requires the appeals
21 process.

22 MR. BERGER: Just a
23 question. Rolando Berger, Medicine. Just for my
24 further understanding, if I understand this correctly,
25 what is being proposed in the ruling is that this
26 limited admissions place in colleges, programs, what
27 have you, must have a or an appeals process. It

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 doesn't require to have a specific type or a specific
2 scope. Is it being left for each individual program
3 and college to decide what their appeals college is?
4 Am I understanding that correctly?

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Correct.

6 MR. BERGER: So I can say
7 my appeals process is, there is no appeal.

8 (Laughter)

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Keeping in
10 line with Professor Marek's comment, one would hope
11 that there would be a more humanistic approach.

12 MR. BERGER: No, I'm not
13 trying to be funny. I'm saying that there is no
14 specific limits of what it must or must not include.
15 You would expect basic humanitarian impulses and some
16 modicum of intelligence would be used to develop this,
17 but it could be tailored individually for each program
18 to develop what they think is appropriate. From going
19 to -- it has to contain, for example, factual errors.
20 You know you might say an appeal is only accepted where
21 factual errors can be proven, like you said my point
22 grade was 5.7 and is, you know, which would be very
23 good, and it's actually 1.2, or what have you, you
24 know. And somebody else may decide to do it a
25 different way. Is that understood? Because, if I
26 understand correctly, there is really not as much to do
27 about nothing if you ask me -- you are not, but if you

1 were to ask me, I would say that.

2 (Laughter)

3 Because the point would be that each
4 individual program and college can make its own appeals
5 process that would suit their needs perfectly well, and
6 it would be fine. If I understand correctly what that
7 says.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That's
9 correct.

10 MS. WALDHART: Yes.

11 MR. DELUCA: Pat Deluca,
12 Pharmacy.

13 We have 520-some applications for
14 admission and only 120 spaces, and most of those
15 students are going to meet the requirements in the
16 program, but there just isn't space. So, how does this
17 play out?

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well --

19 MR. DELUCA: If those
20 students that did not get admitted wanted to appeal,
21 now does this mean that they met requirements, but
22 there's not enough space.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well, Pat,
24 what is your current practice as to whom you select?
25 How do you make that determination?

26 MR. DELUCA: Through the
27 interview process and letters of recommendation and a

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 examination that they -- and the GPA. There's about
2 four criteria that go into it and they're weighted.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well, just
4 like Wally said, sometimes it's a real struggle to try
5 to find out who really is qualified knowing that
6 probably many of them could be well-qualified and could
7 be successful. But as long as a college or a program
8 creates its own rules and then plays by them, that's
9 really what's important. So if students are informed
10 up front what will be reviewed in their admission
11 process so that at least they'll know what's being
12 looked at and then what appeals right they have, if
13 any, to contest it later on.

14 Professor Grossman?

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob
16 Grossman, Chemistry.

17 The first part of what you said, the
18 criteria, what criteria they will be judged on? This
19 is going to be stated by any college that has
20 admissions requirements, so that's not an issue.

21 There is already an appeals process
22 for every program, and that is they can reapply the
23 following year. I'm sorry. I just don't -- I think
24 that this is going to create a horrible bureaucratic
25 mess for an awful lot of programs, and I just don't
26 think that it's necessary or desirable, and it's just
27 going to use up huge amounts of resources for people.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Dean
2 Johnson, would you want the Senate to tell you that you
3 cannot have an appeals process for your college?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I
5 think, stating it perhaps another way is that, you
6 know, colleges have the options of having an appeals
7 process if they think it suits their particular student
8 needs. I can't image our college not having an appeals
9 process given the way we're currently configured. But
10 another option that we would like to pursue if we
11 already had the proposal we have in the works right now
12 in the Senate process is approved, is getting the
13 status, the diplomacy that Architecture and a lot of
14 other programs have and that is to admit students into
15 our program before they are admitted into UK. And then
16 we have a more fully-formed decision.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
18 Tagavi?

19 MR. TAGAVI: Yeah, I'm not
20 saying this appeal thing is 100 percent even.

21 (Laughter)

22 I'm just saying we could be one
23 percent even, and I'd like to know what the sense of
24 the Senate is and this amendment doesn't say to that so
25 I'd like to amend the amendment by dropping number
26 three altogether. This would still allow individual
27 programs have their appeal process. This does not deny

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 anybody if we drop number three. But, so that's my
2 amendment, but just one word. If this is such a good
3 idea, while we almost, it seems to me, unanimously
4 agree it is not good for Medicine, for Pharmacy, for
5 Architecture, for Law. If it's not good for them, why
6 is it good for the rest of us?

7 So having said that, I'd like to
8 make that amendment just to see what the sense of the
9 Senate is.

10 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. The
11 original-- we have still an amendment on the floor.

12 MR. TAGAVI: Of course. I
13 want to amend the amendment.

14 MR. CIBULL: What's the
15 original amendment?

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The
17 original amendment was--

18 MR. CIBULL: I withdraw my
19 amendment.

20 (Laughter)

21 MS. WALDHART: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.
23 Restricting it to undergraduate programs?

24 MR. CIBULL: I would
25 withdraw my amendment.

26 MR. TAGAVI: No. You don't
27 have to withdraw your amendment.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MR. CIBULL: Yeah. And
2 then we'll go with that one.

3 MR. TAGAVI: Okay. Then
4 I'm going to make my amendment.
5 (Laughter)

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Do
7 you have an amendment for us?

8 MR. TAGAVI: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thank you.

10 MR. TAGAVI: To just drop
11 number three knowing -- realizing that any department
12 who wants to have an appeals process could under the
13 existing rule.

14 MR. GESUND: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So
16 the idea, then, Kaveh, is that even if it's not
17 explicitly provided for or disallowed, colleges can
18 still do what they want to.

19 MR. TAGAVI: That is the
20 present rule.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.
22 Questions or discussion about the amendment?

23 MS. DWYER: A question. Is
24 this still a--

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Please
26 identify yourself, Professor Dwyer.

27 MS. DWYER: Roberta Dwyer,

1 Ag.

2 Sorry. Are we still including all
3 colleges, including Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, etc.
4 in this?

5 MR. CIBULL: At this point.

6 MS. DWYER: At this point?

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thus far.

8 MS. DWYER: Okay. So this
9 is the whole University.

10 MR. TAGAVI: But we are
11 dropping this. I'd like to make it clear.

12 MR. CANON: Well only to
13 your amendment.

14 MR. TAGAVI: Exactly.

15 That's what I--

16 (Laughter)

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The
18 amendment is to delete number three.

19 MR. TAGAVI: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

21 MR. DURANT: David Durant.

22 I think the committee had in mind
23 that we have some contract with the students to whom we
24 admit to the University to give them a fair shot at the
25 various programs that they apply to after they have
26 been admitted and that it made more sense to have
27 criteria that looked specifically at programs than

1 simply to overall GPA. If you have a more complicated
2 process than simply looking at overall GPA, the
3 complications allow for errors. It seems to me
4 reasonable to say that you would then allow students
5 the right for some redress in the more complicated
6 system.

7 I sit on the Admissions Advisory
8 Committee that looks at people who ask for a second
9 look in the admissions process. It's fairly lengthy,
10 but it's not overwhelming. I think that the number of
11 students who will appeal these things will not be so
12 great as to engross all of our attention and I think
13 that if the system is reasonable and is trying to look
14 hard at what criteria should be used to admit students
15 to particular colleges, it will be complicated and it
16 gives students a second chance.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So you're
18 speaking against the amendment, and you'd like to see
19 number three be retained. Is that correct?

20 MR. DURANT: Right.

21 MS. WALDHART: I would like
22 to speak against the amendment and go with the original
23 proposal.

24 The students on the student council
25 were among the people who asked that any kind of
26 appeals process be publicized and that there be a date
27 and that those things be included for their

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 information. And, so, they were very concerned about
2 that and it seemed to us to be a reasonable thing to do
3 to indicate when you would know about it, and so that
4 what's that part is there. And I think, on behalf of
5 what I heard the students say, that I think this would
6 benefit them not to vote for Kaveh's amendment.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Matt Falk
8 was the primary component. He's broken his collar
9 bone. That's why he's not here.

10 MR. GROSS: Don Gross,
11 Political Science.

12 I, again, would like to speak against
13 the amendment. I think it is a horrendous idea to
14 suggest that we can set up a program that denies
15 student admission and say even if it's our mistake, too
16 bad. You have no right to appeal. The idea of
17 appealing in a year essentially says to the student:
18 you can stay in the University, find some classes to
19 take, spend the money, and maybe in a year, even though
20 we're the ones that screwed up, you can apply again. I
21 mean, that's not an appeal.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Comments?

23 MR. KENNEDY: Michael
24 Kennedy. Geography.

25 In the first line, there's the word
26 "recommend" and there's the word "must." And they
27 don't seem compatible to me. Should we drop the word

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 "must."

2 MS. WALDHART: No.

3 MR. KENNEDY: We recommend
4 that all programs with selective admissions must have.
5 Don't we just recommend that they have?

6 MS. WALDHART: They are
7 recommending that they have.

8 MR. CANON: Yeah. And if
9 it's adopted, though, the codification would be all
10 programs and colleges must have--

11 MS. WALDHART: Right.

12 MR. BERGER: Berger,
13 Medicine.

14 You know, as I said before, and I
15 want to emphasize that I agree that I think it's a good
16 idea to have an appeals process, and I think it should
17 be publicized. I want to emphasize I don't see the
18 problem if each particular college and program can
19 develop it's own appeals process. You can make it as
20 restrictive as you want or as open as you want
21 depending on what your workload is or what you think
22 you should do. If you don't want to be overwhelmed
23 with it, you can make it, for example, that an appeal
24 has to be based on factual error or mistakes or the
25 presumptual evidence of systematic discrimination based
26 on religion, race or whatever. That's already Federal
27 law anyway. So you would have the very limited

1 possibility to appeal.

2 If somebody wants to be much more
3 generous, he's free to do that. So, all of you -- as I
4 understand it, all we are saying is that a fair process
5 with the selective should have an appeals process that
6 allows mistakes to be corrected, but the terms are left
7 to the individual. It might be, maybe, more palatable
8 if that is put in -- expressly said that. So we
9 recommend that all programs and colleges with selective
10 admissions must have a published appeals process. The
11 development of a specific appeals process will be left
12 to each individual college and department as they see
13 fit, and then we go on from there.

14 So it would not be taken as to mean
15 that everybody has to have the same appeal process.
16 And then there's no problem with having one. You can
17 make it as limited as you want; as open as you want.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So you
19 can't use that to amend the amendment because the
20 amendment currently on the floor is to--

21 MR. DURANT: I guess I
22 spoke against the latest amendment because I don't like
23 it the way it is written either.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.
25 Let's try to wrap this up in the next minute or so.

26 MR. TAGAVI: If what my
27 colleague said was true, I wouldn't have had this

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 amendment, but look at the words, "students who fail to
2 meet requirements." It doesn't say who seemed to have
3 failed or claim to have failed. This appeal would --
4 this language would not allow a no-appeal process or an
5 appeal only based on clerical errors. This appeal,
6 this language requires that you would have exception.
7 When you vote, make sure that you're voting is based on
8 that. It says, "fail to meet requirements."

9 MR. BERGER: That's the
10 part, the wording has to be changed.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: All right.

12 MR. BERGER: Then let's
13 change it.

14 MR. KENNEDY: Change it to
15 -- Michael Kennedy.

16 Change it to those who are rejected
17 from the program rather than failed to meet
18 requirements.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
20 Grossman has the floor.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry
22 for speaking again, but when these admissions decisions
23 are made - - again, we all know and especially number
24 two guarantees, that this is going to be a multi-
25 criteria decision which will probably involve some
26 subjective elements such as which course is the more
27 difficult one or which course is the easier one. To

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 then have a process by which the student appeals means
2 the student is going to have to find out how a decision
3 was made that they were rejected, and that will involve
4 the faculty who made the decision explaining to the
5 students, well, you know, we thought that Organic
6 wasn't quite as hard as Physics and so we thought,
7 well, maybe, you shouldn't, you know, you shouldn't get
8 in because your GPA was 3.82 and this other guy's was
9 3.81. But he took a harder course than you did and so,
10 it's going to open it up to -- again, there's going to
11 be a Pandora's box here opened up, and the student
12 didn't like that decision. They're opening them up for
13 a law suit, then, because it is going to be -- these
14 are going to be subjective criteria by which the
15 students are admitted.

16 So, I think, again, Kaveh's amendment
17 does not prohibit establishing an appeals process by
18 any college that wants to establish it, but to open up
19 that whole process to litigious students who want to
20 appeal just for the sake of appealing or because they
21 want to get in and they don't think anyone should have
22 the right to tell them no. And it's a, again, a
23 terrible idea.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. I'd
25 like to close discussion with one comment from
26 Professor Fortune.

27 MR. FORTUNE: Let me just

1 say this, that this all came up in the context of the
2 Senate's vote to reject the College of Communications'
3 desire to raise the GPA from 2.6 to 2.8, and the task
4 force which was formed had representatives of
5 Communications and B&E, which are the two selective
6 college admissions where the issue comes up, plus A&S
7 and Ag., which tend to be the colleges that those folks
8 wind up in if they cannot be in Communications and B&E.
9 And that's what we concentrated on. It was never
10 considered -- and I think Hans is absolutely right that
11 the way the rule is written, it's not clear that it
12 applies only to undergraduate schools, but it did not
13 come out that this was simply never considered as a
14 rule that would apply to professional schools.

15 And I think that the elimination of
16 number three would cure the concerns of the
17 professional schools, which do have to deal with a huge
18 number of applicants. And possibly a way in which this
19 can go ahead and be passed today is, as has been
20 suggested, to eliminate number three. And that would
21 allow the individual colleges to do what they're doing
22 now because both Communications and B&E do have an
23 appeals process. And I think that would deal with the
24 issue if it's not -- if the amendment fails and number
25 three is left in there, I think in fairness to the
26 professional schools, the matter ought to be referred
27 back to committee and get some professional input on --

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 get some -- get the input from the professional schools
2 on what this mandatory appeals process would cost.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Unless
4 there's a--

5 MR. CANON: I'm calling the
6 question.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. The
8 question has been called to stop debate. All in favor
9 of stopping debate on this topic, please raise your
10 hands.

11 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All
13 opposed?

14 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: NONE)

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: None
16 opposed. So, that brings it to a vote. The amendment
17 now is to strike number three from the recommendations.
18 Okay. All in favor of striking number three, please
19 raise your hand. Let's take a hand count on that,
20 please.

21 ("AYE" HAND COUNT: 34)

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All
23 opposed? In other words, wanting to leave this in.

24 ("NAY HAND-COUNT VOTE: 29)

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: And the
26 first "ayes" were?

27 SARGENT-AT-ARMS: Thirty-

1 four.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Thirty-

3 four to 29. Okay.

4 Is everybody satisfied with the fact
5 that it was counted?

6 MR. TAGAVI: Can we appeal
7 that?

8 (Laughter)

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

10 We're back to the original discussion on the floor and
11 that's -- so the motion has passed to eliminate number
12 three, and now we have just recommendations one, two,
13 four and five.

14 One was changing the University
15 calendar. The second was talking about what has to be
16 stated when there's going to be a change in the
17 admissions requirements. Number four was urging the
18 Provost to reserve a supplement. And five was to
19 manage enrollment by setting freshman and transfer
20 enrollment targets.

21 Professor Steiner?

22 MR. STEINER: I have a
23 comment based on what I've heard from number three and,
24 basically, it goes back to number two. Only just to
25 add -- and, basically, where it says, "each must
26 provide a detailed rationale for each criterion in the
27 proposal."

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Do we want to say and those criteria,
2 once approved, should be published? What I'm trying to
3 get at is letting the students know basically what the
4 criteria are, because we don't really state that
5 anywhere. And if we say -- it shouldn't be just GPA,
6 and each program would state the criteria that they
7 use. So at least the student can say something -- I
8 mean, they would know at least the criteria that are
9 being used to assess their application -- limited
10 enrollment application.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So if I
12 can call on Wally or Pat, since you both talked about
13 the difficulty in managing applications, would this be
14 a problem?

15 MR. FERRIER: No.

16 MR. DELUCA: No.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Do you
18 want to make -- Shelly, do you want to make a formal
19 amendment and then we'll discuss it?

20 MR. STEINER: Well, so,
21 I'll start with -- and I welcome anybody to correct my
22 English or whatever, but to create or change admissions
23 requirements and so and so, each criterion in the
24 proposal -- and then I say and those criterion, once
25 approved, should be published -- should be made public.

26 MR. JONES: Shall.

27 MR. STEINER: Shall?

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MR. JONES: Yes, not
2 should; shall.

3 MR. STEINER: Sorry, Davy.
4 Shall.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Is
6 there a second?

7 MS. WALDHART: SECOND.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Did
9 you hear the wording of Shelley's amendment? Any
10 questions or discussion about it?

11 MR. CANON: If you would
12 again let us know where--

13 MR. STEINER: So it's
14 reading "the Senate rules should be amended to state
15 that all proposal to create or change admissions
16 requirements in colleges and programs must provide a
17 detailed rationale for each criterion in the proposal,
18 and those criterion, once approved, shall be published
19 -- published or made public -- published?

20 MS. WALDHART: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

22 MR. ALBISETTI: Jim
23 Albisetti, History.

24 That would not require publishing the
25 ones that have already been created and are being used
26 now.

27 MS. WALDHART: Right.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MR. ALBISETTI: No. These
2 are new things.

3 MS. WALDHART: Right.

4 MR. STEINER: To create or
5 change admissions.

6 MS. WALDHART: Right.

7 MR. DURANT: David Durant.
8 I believe that since the criteria for admissions have
9 to come through the Senate, they are published in the
10 catalog in any event. I think that the present
11 criteria for admissions for the colleges are--

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Through
13 the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. Other
14 comments about the amendment?

15 MS. WALDHART: This is, I
16 think, that sometimes redundancy is helpful, and I
17 think that by adding that phrasing to it indicates that
18 it should be made public somehow and that I would like
19 to have that amendment added. I think that phrase
20 indicates that there is a process for it, and should it
21 not be clear from the bulletin it should be made public
22 by the unit and program.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All
24 in favor of Professor's Steiner's amendment, signify by
25 saying "aye."

26 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 opposed?

2 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. It
4 stands as amended then.

5 Are you ready for a vote on the
6 report?

7 MS. WALDHART: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Any other
9 points to bring up? Professor Gesund?

10 MR. GESUND: Hans Gesund,
11 Engineering. I don't quite understand that last
12 sentence. For example, "if the rationale of the
13 proposal is predominantly to limit enrollment, then the
14 college or program cannot accommodate the anticipated
15 student load."

16 MR. TAGAVI: There's
17 something missing.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: There's--

19 MR. BAXTER: Unless we
20 compromise academic integrity.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Pardon?

22 MR. BAXTER: Unless we
23 compromise academic integrity.

24 COURT REPORTER: May I have
25 your name?

26 MR. BAXTER: Tony Baxter.

27 COURT REPORTER: Tony,

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 what?

2 MR. BAXTER: Baxter.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I think--

4 MR. GESUND: The college
5 must demonstrate -- the college or program must
6 demonstrate that it cannot accommodate, et cetera. But
7 just to say then the college cannot accommodate would
8 imply that if that thing passes, then the college can't
9 accommodate it. I think the words must -- must
10 demonstrate that it cannot.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I think
12 what may be missing here, you know, is if you put
13 quotation marks- -

14 MR. GESUND: It's an
15 editorial thing.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I'm sorry?

17 MR. BAXTER: It's an
18 editorial change.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yeah.

20 MR. GESUND: It's an
21 editorial change that I'm recommending for
22 clarification.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: What's
24 meant here is that if a college says our rationale of
25 changing our requirements is because we want to limit
26 enrollment, then that college must place somewhere
27 something like "this college or program cannot

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 accommodate the anticipated student load without
2 compromising academic integrity." So that would be
3 their rationale -- an appropriately stated rationale
4 for the fact that they want to limit enrollment.

5 MR. GESUND: That is not
6 what it says.

7 MS. WALDHART: That's not
8 what it says there, so to demonstrate it is necessary.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That's
10 what the meaning, I believe, is.

11 MS. WALDHART: Right.

12 MR. GESUND: So it's an
13 editorial recommendation--

14 MS. WALDHART: It's an
15 editorial recommendation--

16 MR. GESUND: That the
17 college or program must demonstrate--

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That they
19 cannot--

20 MR. GESUND: That it
21 cannot.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Can
23 we just accept that as an editorial comment, then?

24 MR. GESUND: (Nodding
25 affirmatively.)

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Excellent.
27 Are there any--

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MS. WALDHART: I make a
2 MOTION to limit debate.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. A
4 MOTION to limit debate - - to call the question to vote
5 on items 1, 2, 4 and 5 with item 2 editorially amended.
6 All in favor of stopping discussion, signify by saying
7 "aye."

8 ("AYE" VOICE VOTE: ALL)

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All
10 opposed?

11 ("NAY" VOICE VOTE: NONE)

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So
13 on the floor is accepting numbers 1, 2, 4 and 5 from
14 the Selective Admissions Committee with number 2
15 amended or editorially changed as suggested. All in
16 favor --

17 MR. CANON: And amended.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: And
19 amended.

20 MS. WALDHART: And amended.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Got it.
22 Okay. So, all in favor please raise your hands.

23 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: ALL)

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All
25 opposed please raise your hands?

26 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: NONE)

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So it

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 passes unanimously. Okay. Thank you.

2 The next item for business is the
3 report from another committee that was formed last
4 year, and this was the ad hoc committee on graduation
5 contract. To speak to the report of the committee is
6 Tony Stoeppel, who is co-chair of that committee.
7 Fortunately, we have your CD in here.

8 Enid, do you want to present what has
9 gone on up until now with the Senate Council's review
10 or do you want to do that after Tony's presentation?

11 MS. WALDHART: Let's do
12 that after Tony's presentation.

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

14 MR. STOEPPEL: This
15 presentation is really brief. There is three
16 components to it. First of all, we're just going to
17 review what a graduation contract is because there are
18 some members who weren't able to hear the January 2001
19 presentation on graduation contracts.

20 The second component is, we will
21 actually go over the proposed graduation contract for
22 UK and, then finally, there are some examples of the
23 term we call "curricular maps" from Indiana University.
24 That way you can get a better understanding of those.
25 So graduation contract in a nutshell. A student agrees
26 to certain provisions -- basic provisions that we would
27 all expect. If the student fulfills those criteria and

1 for whatever reason -- well, I shouldn't say for
2 whatever reason -- if courses are unavailable, then the
3 University agrees to either substitute that course
4 requirement, waive that course requirement, or, the
5 kicker, pay for addition that student's tuition for a
6 following semester to take that particular class.

7 So the contract itself, number one, I
8 confirm my enrollment in a graduation contract major.
9 The committee expressed interest in having all
10 undergraduate majors at UK within the graduation
11 contract system, and that's what we would prefer.

12 At the end of each year, number two,
13 the students have to complete the minimum courses in
14 the four-year time line. There's also a 128-credit-
15 hour basis that we'll talk about later. But in the
16 four-year time line, the way these are set up is at the
17 end of year one the student must have completed "X"
18 number of hours and these particular courses. So it
19 spells it out right here exactly to the student. This
20 is what you have to do.

21 For number three, the student must
22 register during his or her approved UK priority
23 registration window. And notice that very last line,
24 "...except the courses available in my plan." Well, I
25 don't want to take this course. Well, if that's what
26 fits and that keeps you on the graduation contract,
27 that's what you're going to have to take. And I have a

1 very interesting story to tell you later about that.

2 Number four. Remain in good academic
3 standing and do not be placed on academic probation.
4 If you're placed on academic probation, you're out.
5 The University no longer guarantees you timely
6 graduation.

7 Number five. Really basic. What we
8 would expect. Students meet with their advisor once a
9 semester.

10 Number six. I think, is the most
11 important one, so we'll just read it verbatim. "I
12 accept responsibility for monitoring my own progress so
13 that I can stay on track towards my graduation."
14 Nowhere is it the University's fault because I didn't
15 understand this. No. The University will provide the
16 tools, these curricular maps that makes it explicitly
17 clear. This is what you have to do to graduate in a
18 timely fashion here at UK.

19 Number seven. If graduation is
20 delayed, you should notify your advisor immediately.
21 At Indiana, they have different time-lines. The
22 business school, it's two days after your priority
23 registration window opens. I believe they call it the
24 General College. You have one week to notify someone
25 if a course is unavailable.

26 Number eight talks about changing
27 majors. So the question is, if I sign a graduation

1 contract in one major, can I change my major midstream?
2 Yes, you can. If, after signing a graduation contract,
3 can you change your major and still be on the
4 graduation contract? Maybe. And we'll give an example
5 of that later.

6 Number nine. You may withdraw from
7 the graduation contract by completing a withdrawal
8 form. And there were a lot of questions about this at
9 the Senate Council and we found the answer to that. At
10 Indiana -- this was taken directly from Indiana
11 University's contract, this particular number.
12 Indiana, every time a student withdraws from the
13 graduation contract, whether they personally want to
14 get out of the graduation contract or, for some reason,
15 they did not fulfill all of the requirements, they are
16 required to fill out a withdrawal form. That way it is
17 clear from their standpoint and from the University's
18 standpoint, I'm out of the graduation contract. So, it
19 just simplifies things.

20 And number ten. I may appeal any
21 decision made.

22 (Laughter)

23 We'll move forward.

24 (Laughter)

25 The University, what's its
26 standpoint? Two basic things. They guarantee the
27 student will be able to enroll in courses to permit

1 their graduation and that graduation will not be
2 delayed because of course unavailability. There are
3 three remedies that this contract allows. We discussed
4 those briefly earlier.

5 Number one. Allow the student to
6 graduate per his or her plan by substituting a
7 different course.

8 Number two. You can waive that
9 requirement. Very rarely done.

10 Or number three, the University
11 actually pays for that student to stay another semester
12 and complete those requirements.

13 Curricular maps. This is the
14 foundation, the heart and soul of the graduation
15 contract. I'll go ahead and state -- some of you may
16 know that Indiana has actually dropped their graduation
17 contract because it is no longer compatible with their
18 computer system that they use. However, if you talk to
19 anyone involved with the graduation contract at Indiana
20 they say that the curricular maps was just the best
21 thing that the University ever had. It got things in
22 order. And even though they dropped the graduation
23 contract, they're still using curricular maps and they
24 still plan to continue to use curricular maps. They're
25 what the advisors and the students use to look at --
26 and, again, I have some examples right after this.

27 Many departments at UK already have

1 something similar to these curricular maps that you'll
2 see. Some need to be tweaked a little bit more, a
3 little bit more refined, but we're all on the right
4 track. And these can be set up in two different ways.
5 One is on a time basis, a four-year graduation
6 contract. At Indiana they have another option they
7 call the 128-credit-hour option. So it's not
8 necessarily guaranteed that four years later I will be
9 a graduate, but 128 credit hours later, I will have a
10 degree. So let's look at some of these.

11 The first one, and I hope you can
12 read these, is a curricular map for Chemistry. Just
13 look at the very first box. Fall of your first year.
14 This is a suggested course outline; however, every
15 course that is written in that box must be completed
16 along the top line by the end of the first year.

17 Now, the end of the first year does
18 not mean the end of finals for the spring semester.
19 So, for example, say a student came to Indiana and
20 wanted to receive a B.A. in Chemistry and the first
21 semester they took English Composition and failed.
22 Does that mean they're off the graduation contract?
23 No. They're still on. See? Because they also would
24 then have the spring semester or, here at UK, they
25 would have the four-week Summer or the eight-week
26 summer, if the course is offered during the summer, to
27 fulfill that requirement. And the same goes with all

1 of these.

2 Now, you realize if there's a
3 sequence to these courses -- for example, here at UK,
4 if you're an Engineering major, you have to take Math
5 113 and Math 114 your first year. If you fail 113, you
6 then have to take that in the spring. You would have
7 to take 114 in the summer. What if Math 114 is not
8 offered in the summer? That's your problem, because it
9 was offered and you didn't fulfill that.

10 Notice in the spring semester of your
11 first year, they have topics course -- and I couldn't
12 find exactly what topics course was. But from the way
13 this article read, it was kind of like the cross-
14 cultural classes that we have at UK. And the poor
15 student that they had interviewed said, yes, my
16 curricular map said I had to take a topics course and
17 none of them fit in my schedule except one and the
18 course title was Viking Sagas, so I had to take that
19 class. And he had to take it to stay on the curricular
20 map, and that's the way it goes. That course was
21 available and it fit his curricular map, so that's what
22 he had to take.

23 All right. I understand this writing
24 is a little bit small so I'll just read a couple of
25 these points to you. First of all, this is from the
26 Business School. Had several questions asked -- well,
27 my major or the department that I'm in, we encourage

1 our students to co-op or intern. By having some four-
2 year contract, if they're gone a semester, well then
3 they're off. Well, this 128-credit-hour option could
4 be used in this situation.

5 The Business School guarantees Grad
6 Pact on 128-credit-hours since business students are
7 encouraged to participate in internships and overseas
8 studies which may not fit into the eight-semester Grad
9 Pact model. Internships or overseas studies may extend
10 a student's at IU beyond four years. Students
11 interested in pursuing overseas studies should see an
12 appropriate advisor early in their academic career.
13 The very top one, if you can read this -- let's see the
14 very last line. Business students will be removed from
15 Grad Pact only if:

16 One: They request it;

17 Two: They fail to maintain good
18 academic standing, which is a minimum
19 of 2.0 GPA each semester; or,

20 Three: They have not completed
21 their degree within eight years.

22 So if the student, you know, decided
23 to intern and intern and co-op and go away for years at
24 a time, that's fine. They're still on the contract as
25 long as they meet these benchmarks. Now, you'll notice
26 that you have benchmark one, freshman year; benchmark
27 two, sophomore year, et cetera, et cetera. That's only

1 done because not every business student wants to go
2 take an internship. Some of them only want to be at
3 the University for four years, and that's why they have
4 that there. For those students, that way they can get
5 an understanding; okay, this is how I have to do it if
6 I want to do a four-year graduation contract. So what
7 is this saying? The Business School guarantees you
8 graduation in 128 credit-hours, but it does not
9 guarantee it in four years. But the way this works
10 out, most of their students do. And if you'll notice
11 at the very bottom they even have internship
12 recommended.

13 Notice -- look in the middle column -
14 - complete admission requirements. At the very bottom,
15 you have the asterisks, grade of C or higher required.
16 The students can see right here, okay, this course that
17 I'm signing up for, I have to get at least a C.
18 Everything is written right there. Required, as a
19 prerequisite for the integrative core. Okay, I really
20 can't fail this thing because it's a prerequisite.

21 All of these little nuances for their
22 program are laid out, and the student can see exactly
23 the course that they're going to have to take through
24 the 128 credit-hours. Notice on the far right, apply
25 to the School of Business no later than April 1st for
26 fall admission. You talk about things that aren't even
27 related to courses, applying to the school, because at

1 Indiana, at the time of this curricular map, all
2 students that were admitted went to their general
3 college and then they went to the other specific
4 colleges. But everything that a student would need is
5 right here on this one sheet of paper, front and back.

6 For the general studies degree, at
7 the very top, they just have several bullet points for
8 the student to keep in mind. This is what I have to
9 do. These are the requirements that I have to fulfill.
10 They are a 128 credit-hour, and the reason I didn't
11 have all four benchmarks is because by the time you
12 compressed it, you couldn't read, so just included the
13 first two. But notice benchmark one, hours completed
14 towards graduation, 30. Complete two of four
15 competencies, and then they list them. It doesn't
16 matter which two, but you have to complete two of them.

17 And then if you look down in the
18 second benchmark, third line, complete all four basic
19 competencies required. So it's spelled out for
20 students. On the other side of the page, it had what
21 these particular courses that fulfilled these
22 requirements were. So it's very simple for the student
23 and the advisor and the faculty to see. This is what I
24 have to do, or the student has to do.

25 Oh, and the very last bullet point,
26 like I talked about earlier, report any class
27 scheduling problems to continuing studies within one

1 week following registration. In Business, you had 48
2 hours from the time your registration.

3 Elementary Education. This one's my
4 favorite one. Number one, maintain an overall GPA of
5 2.5. It spells it out very clear right from the
6 beginning. This is what you have to do. Tells you
7 where to go check to see what your GPA is at that
8 present time. Declare education major, even tells you
9 the building and the room number.

10 I mean, it's all laid out for the
11 students. You have to take this pre-professional
12 skills test. Tells you what scores you have to have on
13 the individual sections. A student has everything laid
14 out in front of them, what they have to do. Meet with
15 your Grad Pact advisor. Complete 32 hours in agreement
16 with your advisor. The reason why they don't have
17 specific courses and they actually sign a benchmark
18 with their advisors, because you'll notice on the right
19 side all of the different competencies and
20 certifications that they have. But even notice that.
21 They put the GPAs required for all these different
22 competencies, so the students can see that. And then
23 at the very bottom, if a student has any question,
24 every single phone number that they'd ever need and an
25 e-mail address is provided. All of this on one sheet.
26 Just excellent, I think.

27 The School of Health, Physical

1 Education and Recreation. Look down at the second
2 benchmark in the middle column and you'll see at the
3 bottom there, fall only and spring only. They have
4 numerous courses that are only offered once a year, and
5 if you look on the far right side, particularly in the
6 third benchmark area, you'll see one, two, three, four
7 courses that are only offered in the fall. The student
8 has no excuse. Well, I didn't know that this course
9 wasn't going to be offered in the spring. It's right
10 here on your curricular map. We don't offer it in the
11 spring. If you didn't sign up for it, that is your
12 problem.

13 What's interesting about this plan is
14 in the very top, there is limited flexibility within
15 this plan since free electives are limited to just four
16 to six hours because they're on a 128-credit-hour plan.
17 Your student isn't allowed to go take this course or
18 that course because I want to expand my horizons.

19 So I guess open the floor to
20 questions, or--Dr. Waldhart?

21 MS. WALDHART: As the
22 Senate Council considered this, we had two questions
23 and concerns. One had to do with the, I guess, fear
24 that this would become such an interesting thing that
25 somehow students who are on the contract would be given
26 preference at registration times. And so we were very,
27 very concerned that during priority registration,

1 nobody would have preference over anybody else in terms
2 of whether they were on this contract or not.

3 Obviously, we liked the idea of the
4 contract. We thought it was something that a lot of
5 people would take, but we didn't want to give
6 preference to anybody regardless of where they are,
7 were, in the program.

8 The other concern that we had really
9 had to do with resources, and so we suggested in
10 addition to the description of the contract procedure
11 to say that the University administration generally
12 commits itself to providing adequate resources to
13 realize the goals of the graduation contract. As
14 course scheduling problems extending from lack of
15 resources in individual units integral to the
16 graduation contract become evident, the University
17 administration must commit itself to providing needed
18 resources to these units in overcoming these resource
19 deficits.

20 We thought that to try and take on
21 this graduation contract, despite the fact that we're
22 talking about some great things that can happen with
23 it, that there is going to be a need for resources for
24 certain kinds of things. And that this ought not to be
25 the burden of the individual units or the colleges, but
26 that it should be something that is committed from the
27 administration to provide the kinds of resources that

1 are available as these needs become apparent. So it
2 isn't necessarily that we are going to know this right
3 away, but we felt that for us to promote this
4 completely, without understanding that resources were a
5 very significant part of this would be remiss. And so
6 the Senate Council added that provision to the
7 graduation proposal.

8 On the other hand, we recommended the
9 approval of the graduation contract with these two
10 additions.

11 MR. TAGAVI: Enid, you
12 didn't read the provision.

13 MS. WALDHART: Yeah.

14 MR. TAGAVI: You kind of
15 talked about it, but you didn't read it.

16 MS. WALDHART: Oh, okay,
17 I'm sorry. It says, "...when it comes to override or
18 priority registrations, students who are not on the
19 contract will not be discriminated against based on
20 their status."

21 MR. TAGAVI: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All right.
23 Before we start, I just want to acknowledge the members
24 of the committee. Tony and Enid, Bill Thom, Jake Gibbs
25 from LCC; Ray Forgey from HHES; and Michelle Soner
26 from Academic Ombud Services.

27 PROVOST NEITZEL: Jeff, let

1 me -- as you know, I have to go at 4:30. Let me make a
2 couple of comments.

3 First, I'd like to compliment Tony
4 and the committee. I think this is excellent work and
5 the contract, I believe, is a good idea for the
6 University. I think it's quite clear that the
7 legislature is going to be looking at graduation rates
8 very seriously in the next year, as well as retention.
9 And for the University to be out in front in doing
10 something that addresses that, I think, would serve us
11 very well. And the graduation contract is one element
12 in addressing retention and graduation rates that we
13 can do, and I think it would serve us quite well to do
14 that.

15 The crucial thing, I think, is that
16 the level at which the three options in terms of
17 waiving the course, finding an alternative to the
18 course, or paying the tuition for the course. When you
19 say the University shall do those, whichever level that
20 one of those is at, the other two need to be there. In
21 other words, you can't have the University -- you can't
22 have a department say, no, no, no, no, we don't want to
23 waive this requirement, or this course doesn't count
24 for that one, and then have, at some other level, have
25 the tuition implications be absorbed. I think and I
26 suspect that Indiana and other places that have done
27 it. That decision or that obligation is made at the

1 same level. In fact, I'd be very surprised if Indiana
2 has paid a dime's worth of tuition for anybody.
3 Perhaps they have, but I'd be surprised about it.

4 The second thing is that I do think,
5 Enid, you're going to have to have some staff person
6 monitor this.

7 MS. WALDHART: Uh-huh
8 (affirmative).

9 PROVOST NEITZEL: But at
10 the places that have it, Tony, what have the resources
11 been? What's the magnitude of resources for monitoring
12 a graduation contract that an institution has had to
13 absorb?

14 I'd also like your thoughts about the
15 first. My second comment, which is you have to make
16 the decisions, it seems to me, at the same level in
17 terms of waiving, finding a substitute for, or paying
18 tuition.

19 MR. STOEPPEL: To my
20 knowledge, at Indiana and Iowa, the two benchmarks that
21 we analyzed very heavily in the committee, not one
22 student has been paid money to stay an additional
23 semester. At Iowa, the University pays -- the high
24 administration pays if a student in a particular
25 department doesn't -- a course is unavailable to him or
26 her. At Indiana, the department pays if that student
27 is unable to get the courses that he or she is required

1 -- the department where that students seats -- sits,
2 excuse me.

3 So, myself, as an Engineering
4 student, if I can't get in Com 181 for four years while
5 I'm here, Dr. Richard Gates, my department Chair would
6 have to pay that money. At Iowa, the Gillis Building
7 would pay for it, just to provide an example. Indiana,
8 in terms of resources, they have one individual in
9 their orientations programs office who is in charge of
10 the graduation contract, and he just oversees the whole
11 thing. That's just one small part of his job.

12 Each of the colleges you may have
13 seen on the Business curricular map has a contact, and
14 that is their responsibility to advise those particular
15 students. As far as other resources, that I really
16 can't answer about the specifics of those, unless you
17 had questions on - -

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

19 MR. YATES: Steve Yates,
20 Chemistry Department.

21 In reading this, it appears that the
22 graduation contract is optional. Wouldn't it be more
23 effective if it were mandatory of all students to have
24 a graduation contract and how is this handled at the
25 two benchmarks you mentioned?

26 MR. STOEPPPEL: It is very
27 optional at the other two institutions. The reason is

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 not all students can participate in a graduation
2 contract. Some students, they come to a University --
3 Chemistry major, just for an example -- and they're
4 very poor in math and they can't take, you know, 113
5 and 114. They have to start out in 108 and 109 and
6 gradually build their way up to that competency. They
7 might have been accepted by the University and they're
8 in that program, but there's other places that they
9 have to build up, so they can't fulfill those
10 benchmarks immediately. Excuse me. A student may have
11 to work and, therefore, cannot be full time. A student
12 might have other family obligations that pull them
13 away. An emergency might come along. You know,
14 there's a host of other reasons why--

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Undecided
16 careers.

17 MR. STOEPPPEL: Exactly.
18 Changing of majors and so forth, why students--

19 MS. WALDHART: I think the
20 emphasis on -- especially for part-time students, there
21 are an awful lot of part-time students around and this
22 is something that they could not -- they absolutely
23 couldn't meet it in four years. It might take them,
24 what, 12 to do things, and so they wouldn't be eligible
25 and I think that we would want any kind of program like
26 this to be optional - - that we would want students to
27 pick it. But the idea is, once they pick it then they

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 have a clear obligation as part of it rather than just
2 saying , oh, the University messed me up so now you owe
3 me. Here the burden, I think, really can be placed on
4 them.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Mike, did
6 you have your hand up?

7 MR. CIBULL: Yeah. I had a
8 couple of questions.

9 You had mentioned before in the
10 Senate Council and then again today and it really
11 bothers me that Indiana dropped the graduation
12 contract. And I find their excuse that they changed
13 their computer system to be less than compelling. I
14 think that the plan of how to graduate is an excellent
15 one, but I'm not sure that the logistics of a
16 graduation contract are all that great an idea. It
17 strikes me that there probably is a lot of resources
18 that have to be given to this process to make sure that
19 students actually can follow it. I think that the
20 voluntary part of it is the grid -- whatever that -- I
21 can't remember what you called it.

22 MS. WALDHART: Curricular
23 map.

24 MR. CIBILL: The curricular
25 map, which is I think a great idea. It puts the total
26 onus on the student. It informs them completely about
27 what they have to do and it leaves it up to them to do

1 it.

2 Now, I realize that the problem there
3 is that the University can screw them over royally by,
4 you know, not having courses available when they
5 should. That could be monitored and changed, I would
6 think, without having this process. So I'm not
7 convinced that this is -- I think that the curricular
8 map is a great idea. I'm not so sure that the
9 graduation contract is a great idea.

10 MR. STOEPPPEL: Let me
11 respond to Indiana dropping because of their computer
12 system. There was an article in the Chronicle in mid-
13 December of last year that explained this all. It was
14 going to cost - - I believe it was a quarter of a
15 million dollars in computer research work to re-code
16 their computer system to fit the graduation contract.
17 And then, was it \$25,0000 a year? I mean, just an
18 enormous sum every year after that.

19 MR. CIBULL: What's it
20 going to cost us?

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: If I could
22 add to that, though, the part of the story you may not
23 understand. I spoke with Bob Eno, who's the faculty
24 Senate president at Indiana. Their graduation
25 contract, the Grad Pact, essentially was handed to them
26 from their President saying you will do this. So, in
27 the end, their Senate was not very disappointed to let

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 it go. So, the situation was a little different. This
2 proposal has risen, actually, from the students. So
3 did you want to address--

4 MR. CIBULL: So it was the
5 Senate that decided not to do it.

6 MS. WALDHART: No.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Correct.

8 MR. CIBULL: The
9 administration that handed it to them decided not to do
10 it.

11 MS. WALDHART: That's
12 right.

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Right.

14 MS. STATEN: Ruth Staten,
15 College of Nursing.

16 I have a question and then another
17 question/comment kind of thing. Do we know how many
18 students on an annual basis are affected by not getting
19 a class and it delays their graduation?

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes.

21 MS. STATON: Okay. Well,
22 let me just make my other comment, then.

23 This kind of goes back to the
24 previous conversation as well. I'm from the College of
25 Nursing. We have a selective admission. We have to
26 limit our admissions because of State-mandated limits
27 on the number of students that we can accommodate per

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 faculty. So we have students who come in as pre-
2 Nursing majors, don't get admitted after that first
3 year. Then what?

4 MR. STOEPPPEL: In your
5 Nursing curricular map, either at the end of the first
6 year or the second year, you just put as one of the
7 benchmarks you must complete -- must be accepted by the
8 College of Nursing. If they're not accepted,
9 contract's off. You didn't fulfill that requirement.
10 It's over with. Just in the -- Is this the senior
11 survey?

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Graduate.
13 Exit senior survey.

14 MR. STOEPPPEL: 2002, 2001
15 and 2000, about 18; 16.3, 17.4, and 17.8 percent
16 disagreed or strongly disagreed that required courses
17 were offered so that I could complete my degree on
18 time.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That's the
20 exit survey done of seniors at UK.

21 Professor Marek?

22 MR. MAREK: Do we know how
23 a lot of the percentage of the student body at the
24 University -- bench marking students actually took the
25 course?

26 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes.

27 MR. MAREK: Because maybe

1 it's a problem with material.

2 MR. STOEPPPEL: Here you'll
3 see, 1995 through 2000, the yellow is non-participants
4 in the graduation contract. The blue is the
5 participants in the four-year graduation contract. As
6 you can see, the first year, it was about 60/40, non-
7 participants to participants.

8 As time went on, by the year 2000,
9 three out of every four students that attended the
10 University of Iowa signed their graduation contract
11 when they came during their summer advising period. So
12 it took about six years, but 75 percent -- it really
13 can't get too much better than that because some of the
14 students that you admit, they're not going to be able
15 to sign a contract.

16 MR. MAREK: But did it have
17 any affect. I mean, you know--

18 MR. STOEPPPEL: Yes.

19 MR. MAREK: People can sign
20 all sorts of things.

21 MR. STOEPPPEL: Okay. In
22 the three years of research that we have from Iowa,
23 their graduation rate increased almost five percent in
24 three years. And you can see, it was holding fairly
25 steady, in between 30 and 35 percent, and then it just
26 kind of took off. And they're seeing the same things
27 now today. I'm sorry I don't have that data.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Kaveh,
2 then Susanne, then Roberta.

3 MR. TAGAVI: I have two
4 concerns or two comments. One of them first is
5 philosophical and the second one is practical. I'm not
6 a lawyer, but all of my best friends are lawyers.
7 (Laughter)

8 They tell me to have a contract, you
9 have to have two parts, an offer and a consideration.
10 Please correct me. I know I'm probably not very
11 accurate on that. There is a offer here; there is no
12 consideration. Students are not putting up anything.
13 They won't lose anything if they enter or if they
14 withdraw. And, in fact, this relates to an earlier
15 comment of forcing, that we need a contract. What does
16 it mean to force, that we would? There is no
17 consideration. There is nothing to lose. That's
18 philosophical.

19 I know we have discussed this and, by
20 the way, anybody who would come to Senate Council
21 several times and brave us, you are to be commended.
22 Okay? I praise you.

23 My second practical question is
24 number six. Oh, by the way, on that first one, there
25 was an offer or proposal on the Senate Council to
26 require a \$100 fee, refundable if they stay in the
27 contract and finish. It not only, I think, got

1 defeated, but I do not like it, either.

2 I also don't like the idea that there
3 is no consideration. Number nine says, I understand
4 that I may be dropped from the University of Kentucky
5 graduation contract at any time by completing the
6 graduation contract withdrawal form. What if somebody
7 doesn't withdraw and they are not in conformance with
8 the contract? It doesn't say it. If there is a
9 mechanism and if you read the order, the term implies
10 you could be kicked out. I'm sure you mean a person
11 could be kicked out even if they don't withdraw,
12 correct?

13 MR. STOEPPPEL: Yes.

14 MR. TAGAVI: So, then, why
15 require them to withdraw from something that doesn't
16 cost them anything in the first place? It just
17 practically doesn't make sense.

18 MR. STOEPPPEL: I am trying
19 to think of what I said in my e-mail to you this
20 morning.

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. TAGAVI: I did receive
23 an e-mail.

24 MR. STOEPPPEL: Okay. The
25 way they have that set up at Indiana, you sign the
26 withdrawal form mid-year if you know, hey, I'm changing
27 my major, I'm getting into something else, I'm not

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 going to be on a graduation contract any more. Or you
2 sign it at the end of the year when you come to the
3 realization, you know what, I failed this class, it's
4 not offered during the Summer, I'm off the graduation
5 contract. In either case, you sign this withdrawal
6 form and in your mind and in the University's mind, you
7 are no longer on it. And then you can stop worrying
8 about it. And then the University won't have to check
9 up on you in the following weeks when they're going to
10 do the audits for the graduation contract.

11 MR. TAGAVI: This is a
12 hollow request and students are smart. They know if
13 they just ignore you, nothing happens to them. And it
14 just -- they might lose respect for this if you require
15 them something that if they don't do, nothing would
16 happen to them.

17 MR. STOEPPPEL: All I can
18 say to that is they use it quite effectively at
19 Indiana.

20 MR. TAVAGI: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Susanne?

22 MR. ARNOLD: Along the same
23 lines -- Susanne Arnold.

24 I guess I'm wondering who polices the
25 person that switches majors?

26 MR. STOEPPPEL: The
27 curricular maps.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MS. ARNOLD: Who's lost
2 money? What's the cost of switching your major if you
3 switch to another college or department and you've kind
4 of, you know, done some bad work or not enough work in
5 one thing and then switch your major into a different
6 college? Is it the first college's fault that you
7 didn't do the good work and you switched to a different
8 major and you don't finish in four years, or is it the
9 second college's fault -- I mean second department's
10 fault? Do you follow what I'm saying, or is that
11 confusing?

12 MR. STOEPPPEL: I think I
13 do.

14 MS. ARNOLD: Say you missed
15 -- you flunked a class, but then you suddenly decide
16 you want to change majors and you were in Education and
17 you decide you want to go to, you know, Arts or
18 something. And who's fault is that?

19 MR. STOEPPPEL: Okay.

20 MS. ARNOLD: If we're going
21 make people responsible, fiscally responsible for that?

22 MR. STOEPPPEL: I think I
23 understand. Let me give an example that I can relate
24 to. A student comes to UK. They say I'm a Math major,
25 and they take Math 113, Math 114, and a bunch USPs.
26 And they decide, you know what, this theoretical stuff
27 isn't for me. I need applied Math. I need to go to

1 Engineering.

2 Well, they do this in their spring
3 semester, and they go to the advisor and the advisor
4 says, well, you know, you need to take Chem 105 and
5 107. You can take 105 this spring, but 107 isn't
6 offered in the summer, so you're no longer on the
7 graduation contract if you change your major. Now say,
8 for instance, that the student just went ahead and took
9 Chemistry 105 that first semester, that fall semester,
10 and decides, yeah, I need to change to Engineering.
11 The advisor says okay, you need to take 107 this
12 semester. It might not -- I don't know if it's
13 required by Math or not, but it is required for
14 Engineering. So if you want to do that, you're going
15 to have to drop this USP course that you originally
16 signed up for, get in 107, complete all these other
17 requirements that we have on our curricular map and
18 then, yes, you can sign a graduation contract under
19 Math and by fulfilling all of the requirements for the
20 major's curricular map you are changing to, you can
21 change your major and remain on the graduation
22 contract. But that is kind of difficult.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
24 Dwyer?

25 MS. DWYER: Roberta Dwyer,
26 Department of Agriculture.

27 I think before I could responsibly

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 vote on this as a Senate member, I need to know how
2 much it's going to cost the University of Kentucky. It
3 doesn't matter what it costs at Indiana or Iowa or the
4 University of Finland to implement this process, which
5 I think is a good one.

6 How much is it going to cost here?
7 Because we are under budget cuts. If the explanation
8 is, well, we'll put it on our professional staff, our
9 professional staff's on a hiring freeze and they're
10 overworked right now. And I think it would be
11 irresponsible for us to vote on this and give the go
12 ahead without knowing, you know, a fairly good
13 projection of how much it's going to cost this
14 University.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Ernie, are
16 you addressing that?

17 MR. YANERELLA: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

19 MR. YANERELLA: As you
20 know, I had a lot of skeptical questions throughout the
21 Senate Council debate, and I was only brought over to
22 the side of confirming it after we discussed at some
23 length what seems to me to be sort of the tacit
24 dimension to the graduation contract. The graduation
25 contract process involves not only a contract between
26 students and the University. It also implicitly
27 involves a contract between the administration and the

1 different academic units, i.e., the faculty. For that
2 reason, some of us came up with a second proposal that
3 Enid wrote in regard to issues of resource deficits.

4 My department is understaffed in
5 terms of faculty and even though we have a flexible
6 major, I could imagine that students could have some
7 difficulty under some circumstances in meeting the
8 four-year contract. In that particular event, it seems
9 to me, it is a requirement of the administration to
10 respond to those resource deficits so that we can
11 earnestly meet the expectations of our students. I
12 don't know if anyone could cost out beforehand what
13 this will cost administratively. What I do expect is
14 that the administration will honor that expectation,
15 that as resource deficits are found, they will be
16 closed, evident that the administration -- certainly
17 Mike Neitzel spoke very positively about this. There
18 are powerful political reasons why the administration
19 would be very, very positive on this, but what the
20 second proposal from the Senate Council that enjoins
21 with this overall proposal seeks to do is to is to
22 remind the administration that it ought not -- that the
23 graduation contract ought not to be hoisted on the
24 backs of either the faculty or the staff.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Bob, then
26 Bill.

27 MR. GROSSMAN: Bob

1 Grossman, Chemistry.

2 Dr. Neitzel mentioned something that
3 I think is an important issue that needs to be resolved
4 before this can be approved completely. And I'm not
5 sure exactly what a vote, I guess, here would apply in
6 terms of the process of approval. But it seems to me
7 that if we -- who makes the decision about whether a
8 requirement is waived is very important because if that
9 isn't decided now, what's going to happen, what may
10 happen in the future is that a course can be offered
11 and a student, you know, needs to have either tuition
12 paid or has to have the requirement waived and someone
13 is going to say to the department, waive the
14 requirement and the department says, well, we can't
15 waive this requirement. It's very important. And
16 then someone's going to say, waive the requirement.
17 And so I don't know who makes that decision about
18 whether the requirement can be waived.

19 What I would be in favor of is saying
20 that their requirement should not be waived because
21 then that excuse is removed for not offering the
22 course. On a minor note, one of your things, one of
23 your contract items said that students shall see an
24 advisor for personal problems of any kind. That's a
25 little bit too broad for me as the advisor.

26 (Laughter)

27 So I would change of any kind to

1 that would - - that might impede academic progress.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Bill Thom.

3 MR. THOM: Bill Thom,

4 Agriculture.

5 I would like to mention that I think
6 we've heard questions about resources and that kind of
7 thing. I think one of the advantages that hasn't been
8 mentioned maybe is to diminish the first year or so as
9 you get into it, but in planning by academic units.
10 Certainly as we have heard in discussions in other
11 meetings is that -- and from Provost Neitzel before, in
12 some of the things that he's talked to us about is that
13 when a department or academic units have an opportunity
14 to get published lists of people who are in
15 contracting, to me this is an advantage planning-wise,
16 and I'm not sure if we can put a plus-dollar value on
17 that to offset any expenses, but I think it's an
18 important factor.

19 MR. STOEPPPEL: Could I make
20 a comment about that?

21 These couple, Dr. Yanerella's and Dr.
22 Thom's comments, all students at UK have to take an
23 oral communications course. Most of them have to take
24 Com 181. If all of the departments made curricular
25 maps, and the College of Communications could see, hey,
26 every single one of the these students is going to be
27 advised to take Com 181 in the spring semester, then

1 why even offer it in the fall? Do you understand my
2 point with that? Why allocate those resources if none
3 of the students are going to be advised at that time?

4 If all the Engineering curriculums
5 were to say, call up Dean Johnson's school and say,
6 we're going to advise our students to take Com 181 the
7 second semester of their sophomore year... We admitted
8 1,500 students this fall. Typically, we lost about 300
9 by that time. You are going to have 1,200 students
10 coming over to your college to take Com 181.

11 The other thing that could happen is
12 this oral communications requirement might be expanded.
13 The department might decide to have their own oral
14 communications course.

15 The next thing is Dean Johnson gets
16 to go up to the Gillis Building and say, President
17 Todd, Provost Neitzel, the Engineering College, one
18 college, called me and said they're sending 1,200
19 students to me next year in the spring. I only have
20 two faculty members that can teach that course.
21 There's no way they can do 600 at a time. Send me
22 money so I can hire some folks. Well, if those
23 students have signed the graduation contract, then
24 they're going to have to do something because they
25 certainly aren't going to waive the University studies
26 requirement. How do you substitute Com 181? I don't
27 know. Does the University want to have to pay tuition

1 for six-how-many-hundred people to stay longer?

2 MS. STATON: I was thinking
3 about a conversation that Provost Neitzel had with us a
4 couple of months ago, I think, where he said that there
5 would be caps on classes that could be taught five per
6 graduate, that you had to have at least five students
7 enrolled and 15 students in an undergraduate. I can't
8 remember the numbers. But I guess I would have some
9 concern that a department could really be caught
10 between a very -- in a very tough spot if they don't
11 have a class that needs to -- that students need, but
12 there's not adequate enrollment for it. I don't know,
13 I just ... That would be awful.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: We haven't
15 heard much more about that since then. There's nothing
16 formal going forward that I'm aware of.

17 MR. GROSS: Don Gross,
18 Political Science.

19 I think, again, from what we've spent
20 so much time on today, this is going to be particularly
21 problematic for those colleges that do have selective
22 admissions, because one of the real advantages, whether
23 it's a map or a matrix, or whatever you want to call
24 it, is this whole notion of if I do this, this, this,
25 and this, I'll graduate at this particular time. There
26 is an implication there that if I take this course,
27 this course and I need to get at least a C in this one

1 and at least a B in this one, et cetera, that at this
2 point, whether I want to get into Nursing or Business
3 or whatever, I will get in.

4 Now, if you just have a statement to
5 say it's your responsibility, that's not going to go
6 over with students because they're going say, I assumed
7 when I did all of this and got the C, got the B, got
8 the C, that that would be enough to get me in. And so
9 there needs to be a much greater clarification to the
10 student that this is a much more iffy chance of
11 fulfilling the contract because this is not just
12 minimal requirements.

13 There are additional requirements
14 that you're going to have to have for admissions, but I
15 guess you could appeal.

16 MR. STOEPPEL: I guess if
17 you're talking about selective admission schools, for
18 example, like the Nursing School, you just make that a
19 requirement; and if you're not accepted, that's part of
20 it.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: The students
22 won't perceive it that way.

23 MR. STOEPPEL: Well.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: They
25 perceive, I got out all the--

26 MS. STATON: It's on the
27 contract.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 MS. WALDHART: It's on the
2 contract.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
4 Jasper.

5 MS. JASPER: Sam Jasper,
6 Dentistry. I like the curricular map idea.
7 I think that's a really good one. The question I have,
8 and I think I can see as a faculty member it being an
9 extreme benefit to the University to have this
10 contract, but if I put on a hat and try to be a
11 freshman in college again and walked in, I'm just not
12 sure that I see all the benefits from the student's
13 standpoint. I'm not seeing that it really benefits the
14 student that much. I see great benefits for the
15 University. But if I'm the student, I don't really see
16 where it's going to help me that much. Especially, if
17 I wanted to take -- if I wanted to try and broaden my
18 horizons, I get in there and say, gee, you know, I got
19 interested in some other areas and I'd like to take
20 some courses in those areas; but, boy, if I do that,
21 then I'm off the contract.

22 The other thing that may be in the
23 minds of students, trying to think back to things that
24 students think about, is this going to be held against
25 me if I get out of this contract, if I decide I really
26 want to be out of it.

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Shelley.

1 MR. STEINER: Students --
2 Sam, you're right. I mean, Biology has 800 students --
3 advisees. The point was they pick up on what's going
4 on. I think the benefit of this -- cost to the Senate.
5 But, I think, the benefit of this is that they have to
6 hone in on what's going on right away. Students can go
7 for two years and not know what's going on. It kind of
8 gives them something to hone in one when they first
9 come in.

10 If you're advised properly when they
11 first come in, when they discuss the contract for any
12 particular major, they'll have to really think about
13 what's going in the majors, what's required. That's,
14 to me, one of the most important things with this. Not
15 only that, but it gives them something to look forward
16 to. I don't think, as far as the additional
17 administrative costs, the problem concerning that --
18 where I didn't understand what the Provost said,
19 Provost Neitzel said, was he implying that Deans could
20 assess whether or not a course -- I'm going back to
21 what you're saying -- that additional course -- that,
22 for instance, accredited courses could be assessed by
23 Deans? Or above that -- or that waiving of a course
24 should be assessed by administrative - - that's
25 essentially what we're saying. If administrators pay
26 the bill, then they should have the say. It's not
27 without strings. It's not about strings. So that

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 should - - that should be...

2 COURT REPORTER: May I have
3 your name, please?

4 MR. STEINER: Steiner;
5 Shelley Steiner, Biology.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Enid.
7 Then Kaveh.

8 MS. WALDHART: One of my
9 concerns as we were going through this was as a person
10 who deals very closely with Com 181 and the oral
11 communications skills requirements, I can tell you that
12 without additional resources there is no way we could
13 in any way come close to having 3,600 new students get
14 through the Oral Com School requirement. I mean, we
15 are making progress on 2,500. There's just no way that
16 we can do it in terms of meeting things within the
17 first two years or an added thousand each year. And it
18 sounds like that's going to be there.

19 And so, for me, this commitment of
20 resources is something that is really critical. I
21 don't know that I want this waived by anybody. I think
22 it's a significant thing. I can't imagine that our
23 unit's the only one that is influenced by this, because
24 it seems to me that all the University studies courses
25 are going to be impacted by this kind of decision and
26 that some kind of assurance that says, my department
27 isn't going to have a budget if for some reason we have

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 to come up with 1,500 students more each semester. I'm
2 not quite sure how we would do that. But at any rate,
3 if the concern about who is paying for when -- I think
4 it's a very significant one and that we need to know
5 something about that in order to deal realistically
6 with meeting this kind of demand.

7 I love the idea of the contract. I
8 love the idea of the curricular map, but I don't want
9 to have to pay for each students' tuition because they
10 can't get Com 181, and I can tell you they aren't going
11 to be able to get Com 181.

12 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: May I
13 intervene for just one second?

14 There's two ways to look at this.
15 The Senate can try to put together the finished package
16 of what this would be like in which case, we would be
17 here all evening and several days beyond. The other
18 way to look at is that we're buying -- or we're looking
19 into voting on a concept, the framework, which has been
20 outlined here and the important details the Senate
21 feels must be included in the final implementation, to
22 use a word. So that's the other way to look at it,
23 that you can develop your preference now as to what you
24 think must be included or should be included in the
25 final execution of it.

26 MR. TAGAVI: It's a
27 question of who waives doing what in the department.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Let's say my department -- he tried to get into the
2 required course and somehow we cannot get the student
3 in. We go to the Dean and he says, okay you cannot
4 take (inaudible); all right, you can take Japanese
5 course instead. That would be the concept. Who is
6 going to waive the requirement? Combine this if Dean
7 has to pay himself. That is somewhere I don't want to
8 be.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: But we
10 brought up in Council, the Deans already cannot do--

11 MR. TAGAVI: I thought I
12 head that from Tony Stoeppel, yes, that the Deans could
13 waive requirements.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes.
15 Robert?

16 MR. GROSSMAN: I would like
17 to make a MOTION that according to what you -- similar
18 to what you just stated, that we APPROVE the concept,
19 but do not actually approve its implementation until
20 specific details are given about who makes the
21 decisions about what to do in case a student cannot
22 fulfill their contractual obligations.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Please
24 take it a step further and outline how you'd like that
25 decision making to occur. How shall we determine
26 who's--

27 MR. GROSSMAN: Obviously, I

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 think it needs to be a Senate committee.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Needs to be
4 the one to make that decision.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Then I
6 suggest that the original graduation contract committee
7 work with administration to develop those particulars?
8 Would that be--

9 MR. GROSSMAN: That would
10 be fine. But as long as it's stated we're not
11 approving it -- that it will come to a vote -- that it
12 will come to us for a vote again after those details
13 have been worked out.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Is
15 there a second?

16 MR. CIBULL: Well, wait a
17 minute. So this is a MOTION TO TABLE?

18 MR. GROSSMAN: It's pretty
19 much a motion to table. In other words, to send back
20 for further working.

21 We're approving the concept, but
22 we're not approving it's implementation until these
23 details are worked out.

24 MR. BLYTON: That's a
25 table.

26 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, to
27 approve the concept, but without it's implementation

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 until these details are worked out.

2 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there a
3 second?

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Maybe I
5 should just change that to, we table this until these
6 details are worked out.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.
8 There's a motion on the floor that needs to be seconded
9 first.

10 MS. WALDHART: SECOND.

11 MR. CIBULL: Restate the
12 motion.

13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I
14 want to say that we should table this until these
15 details about who makes the decision as presented that
16 -- the details about who decides either a waiver of the
17 requirement, a substitute requirement , or--

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Or it's
19 the University that pays tuition.

20 MR. CIBULL: Okay.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: That until
22 that decision -- until it is made clear who makes those
23 decisions, how those decisions will be handled, we
24 can't approve the contract.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So
26 I suggest that we take both the tabled, seconded by
27 Professor Waldhart.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Professor Kramer?

2 MR. KRAMER: Well, we'll
3 let you vote on that.

4 I was going to add the possibility of
5 considering some kind of trial limitation, that I think
6 it's going to be a very difficult process to set up in
7 reality. But with some particular programs, they want
8 to take this up, that one possibility would be voting
9 the implementation in whenever that's decided with a
10 very finite period after "X" or in two years, we look
11 at that trial run. But I think it's going to be almost
12 impossible with no limitations. But I do like the idea
13 and I think, in the end, this is really an advising
14 tool, more than anything else, for students to see what
15 they need to do.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Do you
17 want to speak to the motion?

18 MR. BLYTON: It's not
19 debatable. The motion to postpone is not debatable.

20 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So we need
21 to take a vote, then?

22 MR. BLYTON: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

24 Thank you.

25 (Laughter)

26 So the MOTION has been made and
27 SECONDED to table this to determine further who will be

1 making these decisions. Okay.

2 All in favor of supporting the
3 motion to table, please raise your hands.

4 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: MAJORITY)

5 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All
6 opposed to the motion?

7 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: 6)

8 MR. BLYTON: There's a
9 majority vote.

10 MS. STATON: I'm probably
11 way out of order. People have been working on this for
12 a really long time and it's a lot of energy and effort
13 and time commitment. And I guess I wonder, does the
14 committee need some notion of whether people are really
15 in favor of this or not before they spend more time?
16 That's my concern.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I wish
18 that the timing had worked better for Mike Neitzel to
19 have been able to attend more of the meeting, because I
20 sense that there's some discomfort with an already
21 burdened University budget and a potential program that
22 might cost additional resources, human, fiscal or
23 otherwise.

24 Mike?

25 MR. CIBULL: Yeah, I think
26 the two issues that I heard repeated were, one, who's
27 going to be making the decision, the academic

1 decisions; but also, what's the cost of this. And I
2 think that that committee does need to come with up
3 some estimate of cost, because I think that what we're
4 all afraid of is unfunded mandates, and I don't think
5 that's acceptable at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Bill? A
7 member of the committee.

8 MR. THOM: Bill Thom,
9 Agriculture.

10 One of the issues, I guess, being on
11 that committee and discussing through the process, are
12 what are some of the alternatives. And, of course,
13 Tony mentioned the fact that Indiana was facing
14 \$250,000. Florida, as I understand it, is going to
15 have a computer-derived system that does very closely -
16 - but they committed the resources which are \$200,000
17 or \$250,000 to do that kind of alternative. And so I
18 think those two cost figures, at least for Florida and
19 Indiana, are realistic for what it would cost otherwise
20 to really monitor what is going on with the students,
21 if that's what you're after.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there a
23 hand up in the back?

24 Jackie?

25 MS. HAGAR: May I ask a
26 question?

27 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Jackie

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 Hagar from the Registrar's office.

2 MS. HAGAR: Jackie Hagar,
3 Registrar's office.

4 I'm sorry. I don't often visit with
5 the Senate, but I do have a question that I'd like to
6 have considered.

7 When you're talking about the waiver
8 and that would be, if a requirement is waived, does
9 that reduce the required hours for the program
10 completion? Or are those hours made up some place
11 else?

12 MR. GROSSMAN: That's
13 another question for the committee.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Enid?

15 MS. WALDHART: I'd just
16 like to suggest -- I think that this is speaking a bit
17 to what IPSE had suggested, and that is it possible for
18 us to say we think the idea of curricular maps is a
19 very significant one and that in the interim, while
20 we're waiting for this other to happen, could we not
21 encourage all programs to develop the curricular maps
22 so that that's there? Because if that's in place, it's
23 going to make the implementation process a whole lot
24 easier because we'll know what kinds of courses that
25 are there.

26 So I think we might be able to
27 approve that part of the graduation contract, to say

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 that at the very least right now we could approve the
2 concept of curricular maps and encourage all units to
3 develop one, sort of ASAP.

4 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Do you
5 want to make that a motion?

6 MS. WALDHART: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So
8 the MOTION from the Senate floor, then, is to encourage
9 all departments and programs to develop curricular
10 maps, to show students how to graduate in a timely
11 fashion and the typical sequence of courses they would
12 take.

13 MS. WALDHART: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is that--

15 MS. WALDHART: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Is there a
17 second?

18 MS. STATON: SECOND.

19 MS. ARNOLD: Wait a minute.

20 Can I make a comment about that?

21 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: A point of
22 order?

23 MS. ARNOLD: This is a
24 question?

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. Go
26 ahead.

27 MS. ARNOLD: Who's going to

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 provide the information about what a curricular map is?
2 This is the very first time I've ever heard the words
3 "curricular" and "map" put together and shown on a
4 screen. Who's going to police that, show them what
5 that means? I mean, I think it's a great idea, too,
6 but it looks like it would make a -- it would simplify
7 a lot of things if you have one page that you could
8 stick up on your desk and say that's what I've got to
9 do to get done with my degree. But, I mean, where's
10 that information going to come from? Are you going to
11 print out your PowerPoint slides and send them to
12 everybody?

13 CHAIRMAN DEMBO:
14 Surprisingly, Susanne, when Tony and I spoke with the
15 Deans of various colleges, there's many programs and
16 colleges that already--

17 MS. ARNOLD: Who already do
18 this?

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: --that
20 already have this in place. It's not called that.

21 MS. ARNOLD: We don't have
22 anything.

23 MR. CIBULL: Yeah, you do.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Professor
25 Braun?

26 MR. BRAUN: Whenever you
27 submit a curriculum proposal to the Senate, you're

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 asked for a curricular map in regards to graduation for
2 your program. So everybody--

3 MS. ARNOLD: Was it already
4 in existence?

5 MR. BRAUN: So I think it
6 already all exists.

7 MS. WALDHART: They come
8 close.

9 MR. BRAUN: We've done that
10 a couple of times.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: There may
12 not be the level of detail, for instance, that only
13 certain courses may be offered during the fall or
14 spring or if you can't take this then, then -- some
15 mechanical types of things that may not already be
16 included.

17 MS. DUKE: Are we on a
18 motion?

19 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes, we
20 are.

21 MS. DUKE: I don't know
22 what this has to do with it, but it seems like one
23 crucial part of this is the advising every, what was
24 it, every year or every six months, is that specified
25 anywhere that that has to happen now, or is that
26 optional? Because it seems as if these curricular maps
27 are already in place, that they're floating around in

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 various programs and they're not happening, and kids
2 aren't graduating, and it might be because nobody's
3 cluing them in they're there and that they really need
4 to pay attention to this. And that's the work of an
5 advisor. So would there be any point in -- or would it
6 even be possible to hook in some kind of recommendation
7 that they be advised in some sort of integral way?

8 COURT REPORTER: May I have
9 your name, please?

10 MS. DUKE: I'm sorry. Mary
11 Duke, Medicine.

12 COURT REPORTER: Mary?

13 MS. DUKE: Duke.

14 MR. YATES: Steve Yates,
15 Chemistry.

16 I mean, in each semester the student
17 has to come see the advisor.

18 MS. DUKE: Okay, so that's
19 already in place.

20 MR. YATES: Right. That's
21 already in place.

22 MS. DUKE: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Phil, I
24 feel this is something, too, that the advising network
25 can be important to that as well.

26 MR. KRAEMER: Jeff, I think
27 there is some sort of rule that the advisors in all the

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 departments do that and it varies quite a bit. In some
2 places, we have discovered that those were reflected
3 somewhat automatically by staff. The ideal may not
4 always be--

5 MR. YATES: I want to thank
6 you all for being on top of it.

7 (Laughter)

8 MR. KRAMER: Let me put up
9 a comment about what I think the Provost was really
10 getting at.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Well, we
12 have to speak to the motion on the floor first.

13 MR. KRAMER: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: But if you
15 can hold just for a second.

16 MR. KRAEMER: What is the
17 motion?

18 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: The MOTION
19 on the floor was to encourage or recommend that
20 departments and programs develop curricular maps in the
21 spirit of--

22 MS. GLASSCOCK: To show
23 students how to graduate in a timely fashion.

24 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Comments
25 about the motion, the motion on the floor?

26 MR. WILDER: I'd like to, I
27 guess, amend that we attach these examples to provide

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 us some sort of guideline, maybe a checklist or an
2 example of some sort.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay.

4 COURT REPORTER: May I have
5 your name, please?

6 MR. WILDER: Brad Wilder,
7 Engineering.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: I think we
9 can do that, an editorial that we have to describe what
10 we're doing. That's okay. You have your hand up in
11 the back.

12 MS. GARVY: Beth Garvy,
13 Medicine.

14 It seems to me that one of the really
15 important things about these curricular maps is that
16 academic units communicate with one another so that not
17 everybody is suggesting that their students take one
18 particular course in the same semester, for instance.
19 And then, so, these basic University requirements get
20 spread out so that the teaching loads are not unusually
21 heavy during certain times of the year as opposed to
22 other times and that communication is going to be
23 really important between the colleges and between the
24 academic units.

25 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: That's
26 another question Tony and I have asked the Deans, is
27 what are the pinch points in your curriculum, and many

1 of the pinch points have already been identified.
2 You're right about that. Again, addressing the motion
3 on the floor?

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah. I'm
5 sorry to speak again, but in Arts and Sciences, Central
6 Advising handles much of the advising of the freshmen
7 and sophomores. They don't even -- or at least the
8 freshmen - - they don't even come into the departments
9 until their sophomore year and, at least in Chemistry,
10 their schedule is already messed up. So to get them
11 graduated by the end of four years ... So if these
12 curricular maps are to have any sort of value at all,
13 they need to be communicated to Central Advising. And
14 I would just add that if we're going to recommend the
15 departments make these, that they be communicated to
16 whoever does the advising of freshmen.

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Other
18 comments? I heard a, call the question. Okay. A
19 MOTION TO STOP DEBATE.

20 COURT REPORTER: Who called
21 the question?

22 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Susanne
23 Arnold.

24 We're stopping debate. We're voting
25 to stop debate on the motion on the floor to ask that
26 curricular maps be developed. Okay?

27 So all in favor of stopping, please

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 raise your hand.

2 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: ALL)

3 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All

4 opposed?

5 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: NONE)

6 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: All right.

7 So then we'll vote now on the motion made by Professor

8 Waldhart.

9 You all understand the motion? Okay.

10

11 All in favor of the motion, please

12 raise your hands.

13 ("AYE" HAND-COUNT VOTE: ALL)

14 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. All

15 opposed?

16 ("NAY" HAND-COUNT VOTE: NONE)

17 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. So,

18 it passes unanimously.

19 MS. WALDHART: So if you

20 just wait until a quarter after five, everything is

21 cool.

22 (Laughter)

23 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: So,

24 Professor Kraemer, you had another point you wanted to

25 bring up?

26 MR. KRAEMER: Just briefly.

27 My sense of what Mike was saying, the Provost was

1 saying, we don't want to--

2 COURT REPORTER: Would you
3 repeat that, please? I'm having trouble hearing you.

4 MR. KRAEMER: My sense is
5 that the Provost is concerned about the separation of
6 those decisions. You don't want central administration
7 waiving courses; but at the same time, you don't want
8 departments to always rely on added resources. And
9 that's going to be a dilemma. The department -- the
10 easiest way for a department to deal with this is to
11 say, just provide the added resources and not to
12 consider waiving a course or adding a subject. And I
13 don't know how that's going to be resolved. I hope the
14 committee will really focus on that and try to address
15 that issue because it's a lingering question.

16 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Okay. One
17 final piece of discussion.

18 We did have on the agenda for today -
19 - you had a late item through your e-mail that
20 Professor Hahn and his committee, the Academic Planning
21 and Priorities Committee, has come up with a very
22 elegant set of recommendations for changes to the
23 governing regulations that will clarify a great many
24 things. There's a lot of material to look through;
25 but, with your permission, what I'd like to do is to
26 still bring it up as an action item at the next Senate
27 meeting because that's one of the items that we had

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY - LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
UNIVERSITY SENATE
APRIL 14, 2003

1 planned to cover. This will give you plenty of time to
2 look at it. I think it should be self-explanatory and
3 will show evidence of the good work that was done.

4 Thank you all very much.

5 MR. CIBULL: Jeff, could
6 you re-send your e-mail?

7 CHAIRMAN DEMBO: Yes. I'll
8 do that.

(MEETING CONCLUDED AT 5:15 P.M.)
